

REMARKS

The Applicant appreciates the courteous and complete examination of the application by the Examiner. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, a reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested.

Regarding the Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner stated that the information disclosure statement filed on December 7, 2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2). The Applicant submits herewith a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document cited in the information disclosure statement.

Regarding the Objection to the Specification

The Applicant submits a substitute specification which includes section headings and which deletes page 11 as requested by the Examiner.

Regarding the Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 4-17 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. Claims 4-17 have been amended to remove all multiple dependent claim language.

Regarding the Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to delete the limitation "the press on device" in line 3. Thereby overcoming this rejection.

Claim 18 has been amended to delete the limitation "at least 2 % to 30 %, preferably at least 3 % to 20 %, and further preferably,.". Thereby leaving "at least 5% to 15%" as the only limitation.

Regarding the Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The Applicant appreciates the time and effort the Examiner exerted in locating the prior art used in the above-identified office action. The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Greulich et al. reference.

In order to expedite the prosecution of this application, claims 1-19 have been amended. Claims 1-19 are now in this application.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations from claims 2 and 3, and further include limitations describing the base body. The Greulich et al. reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of a base body having "at least one region of material aggregate adapted to have a diameter larger than the diameter of shaft", as described in amended claim 1. The region of material aggregate of the base body, in combination with the first cylindrical section, the insertion area, and the second cylindrical section is believed to be patentable distinct from the prior art references. It can be appreciated that amended claim 1 now includes subject matter not disclosed in the Greulich reference and is therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-17 are felt to patentably distinguish over the prior art references because of their above-mentioned dependency from amended claim 1.

Independent claim 18 has been amended to limit the point of contact of the insertion area and the base body to "at least 5% to 15%, of the entire length of the hub from the front face." Additionally, claim 18 has been amended to include limitations that specifically describe the lengths of the first cylindrical section, the insertion area, and the second cylindrical section with relation to the entire length of the hub. These limitations are not disclosed, taught, or suggested in the Greulich et al. reference and is therefore believed to be patentably distinct from the prior art references.

Independent claim 19 has been amended to further describe the base body limitation "as a shaft and having at least one region of material aggregate adapted to have a diameter larger than the diameter of shaft". Additionally, independent claim 19 has been amended to further describe the region of material aggregate as "being adapted to deform when the insertion area and the second cylindrical section is pressed thereon." The deformable region of material aggregate of the base body, in

combination with the size of the insertion area of the hub is not disclosed, taught, or suggested in the prior art references. It can therefore be appreciated that amended claim 19 now includes patentable subject matter distinct from the prior art reference and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

With the above amendments being fully responsive to all outstanding rejections and formal requirements, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel that there are further issues which might be resolved by means of telephone interview, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (403) 444-5695, or email at davidguerra@internationalpatentgroup.com

No additional fee is due.

Respectfully Submitted,

/David A. Guerra/

David A. Guerra, Reg. 46,443

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO, electronically transmitted using EFS-Web, or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

On (Date) 12/10/2007 by David A. Guerra /David A. Guerra/